



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,443	07/24/2003	Michael Hogan	2002P12271US01	9636
7590 06/18/2008				
Siemens Corporation Intellectual Property Department 170 Wood Avenue South Iselin, NJ 08830			EXAMINER COUGHLAN, PETER D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2129	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/18/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/626,443

**Applicant(s)**

HOGAN, MICHAEL

**Examiner**

PETER COUGHLAN

**Art Unit**

2129

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 May 2008.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☒ Claim(s) 45 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date A  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
5) ☐ Notice of Inventor's Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### Detailed Action

1. This office action is in response to an AMENDMENT entered May 30, 2008 for the patent application 10/626443 filed on July 24, 2003.
2. All previous office actions are fully incorporated into this Final Office Action by reference.
3. Examiner's Comment: Although, the terms 'carrier wave' or 'carrier signal' is not specifically mentioned within the specification, the Examiner will exclude these interpretations wherein the context of 'storing data', 'database' is disclosed.

### ***Status of Claims***

4. Claims 1-45 are pending.

Art Unit: 2129

5. Claim 45 is restricted due to claims 1-44 pertain to a batch process and configuration information of pharmaceuticals which claim 45 pertains to the fast food restaurant industry, classification 705/26.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 20, 43, 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) (hereinafter referred to as Deitz) being anticipated by **Deitz**, U.S. Patent 7020876.

Claim 1

Deitz teaches obtaining configuration information from a computer based validated biopharmaceutical batch process control system (**Deitz**, C5:17-46; 'Biopharmaceutical batch process control system' of applicant is equivalent to 'batch oriented process control systems including for example process control systems that

produce pharmaceuticals' of Deitz.); based upon a detected hierarchy among elements of the configuration information automatically obtaining a first transformed version of the configuration (**Deitz**, C4:9-32; 'Hierarchy among elements of the configuration' of applicant is illustrated by 'received a second message containing a set of batch information in response to the first message requesting ... using a graphical user interface and prompts a user to enter a first input identifying a subset of set of batch information from the displayed set of batch information from the displayed set of batch information to be included within at least one batch of the plurality of batches' of Deitz.); transforming the first transformed version of the configuration information using user input to obtain a second transformed version of the configuration information (**Deitz**, Fig. 9, C5:7-9, C13:49 through C14:10; 'First transformed version of the configuration information using user input to obtain a second transformed version of the configuration information' of applicant is equivalent to 'editing' of Deitz.) the user input obtained via a graphical user interface the user input indicative that DHTML logic is to be applied to obtain the second transformed version of the configuration information (**Deitz**, C1:36-50, C16:46-54; 'DHTML logic' of applicant is not true 'logic' in the classical definition of 'logic.' DMTHL is a combination of a number computer languages which enable web pages to be dynamic. Thus since Deitz is able to be edited and be used over the internet, then DHTML is inherent.) expressing the first transformed version and the second transformed version in a destination biopharmaceutical batch process control system, the biopharmaceutical batch process control system configured by the second transformed version to control a biopharmaceutical batch process. (**Deitz**, C8:28-55;

'Expressing the first transformed version and the second transformed' of applicant is disclosed by the ability to 'monitor the campaign status' of Deitz.)

Claim 20

Deitz teaches receiving input relating to an element of the information from a user. (**Deitz**, C8:28-55; 'Graphical user interface' of applicant is equivalent to 'graphical user interface' of Deitz.))

Claim 43

Deitz teaches obtaining configuration information from a computer based validated biopharmaceutical batch process system (**Deitz**, C5:17-46; 'Biopharmaceutical batch process control system' of applicant is equivalent to 'batch oriented process control systems including for example process control systems that produce pharmaceuticals' of Deitz.); based upon a detected hierarchy among elements of the configuration information automatically obtaining a first transformed version of the configuration (**Deitz**, C4:9-32; 'Hierarchy among elements of the configuration' of applicant is illustrated by 'received a second message containing a set of batch information in response to the first message requesting ... using a graphical user interface and prompts a user to enter a first input identifying a subset of set of batch information from the displayed set of batch information from the displayed set of batch information to be included within at least one batch of the plurality of batches' of Deitz.); transforming the first transformed version of the configuration information using user

input to obtain a second transformed version of the information (**Deitz**, Fig. 9, C5:7-9, C13:49 through C14:10; 'First transformed version of the configuration information using user input to obtain a second transformed version of the configuration information' of applicant is equivalent to 'editing' of **Deitz**.), the user input obtained via a graphical user interface the user input indicative that DHTML logic is to be applied to obtain the second transformed version of the configuration information (**Deitz**, C1:36-50, C16:46-54; 'DHTML logic' of applicant is not true 'logic' in the classical definition of 'logic.' DMTHL is a combination of a number computer languages which enable web pages to be dynamic. Thus since **Deitz** is able to be edited and be used over the internet, then DHTML is inherent.) ; and expressing the first transformed version and the second transformed version in a destination biopharmaceutical process control system, the biopharmaceutical process control system configured by the second transform version to control a biopharmaceutical process. (**Deitz**, C8:28-55; 'Expressing the first transformed version and the second transformed' of applicant is disclosed by the ability to 'monitor the campaign status' of **Deitz**.)

#### Claim 44

**Deitz** teaches means for obtaining configuration information from computer based validated biopharmaceutical batch process control system (**Deitz**, C5:17-46; 'Biopharmaceutical batch process control system' of applicant is equivalent to 'batch oriented process control systems including for example process control systems that produce pharmaceuticals' of **Deitz**.); means for automatically obtaining based upon a

detected hierarchy among elements of the configuration information a first transformed version of the configuration information (**Deitz**, C4:9-32; 'Hierarchy among elements of the configuration' of applicant is illustrated by 'received a second message containing a set of batch information in response to the first message requesting ... using a graphical user interface and prompts a user to enter a first input identifying a subset of set of batch information from the displayed set of batch information from the displayed set of batch information to be included within at least one batch of the plurality of batches' of **Deitz**.); means for transforming the first transformed version of the configuration information using user input to obtain a second transformed version of the configuration information (**Deitz**, Fig. 9, C5:7-9, C13:49 through C14:10; 'First transformed version of the configuration information using user input to obtain a second transformed version of the configuration information' of applicant is equivalent to 'editing' of **Deitz**.), the user input obtained via a graphical user interface the user input indicative of a predetermined option regarding the second transformed version of the configuration information (**Deitz**, C1:36-50, C16:46-54; 'DHTML logic' of applicant is not true 'logic' in the classical definition of 'logic.' DMTHL is a combination of a number computer languages which enable web pages to be dynamic. Thus since **Deitz** is able to be edited and be used over the internet, then DHTML is inherent.); and means for expressing the first transformed version and the second transformed version in a process control destination system, the process control destination system configured by the second transform version to control a process. (**Deitz**, C8:28-55; 'Expressing the first



Art Unit: 2129

transformed version and the second transformed' of applicant is disclosed by the ability to 'monitor the campaign status' of Deitz.)

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deitz as set forth above, in view of Jarett. (U. S. Patent 6195665, referred to as **Jarett**)

#### **Claim 45**

Deitz teaches obtaining information from one or more sources(**Deitz**, ¶0010; 'Obtaining information from one or more sources' of applicant is equivalent to 'original conceptual design parameters' of Deitz.); applying a first plurality of pattern matching rules to at least a first portion of the information to obtain a first transformed version of the information, the first plurality of pattern matching rules based on expert knowledge

about a first plurality of patterns in the information (**Deitz**, ¶0010; 'First plurality of pattern matching rules' of applicant is equivalent to 'scale calculations for each of the unit operations' of Deitz.); transforming at least a second portion of the information using user input to obtain a second transformed version of the information (**Deitz**, ¶0010; 'Second transformed version of information' of applicant is disclosed by producing information needed to 'produce the desired amount of product per batch.)), the user input obtained via a graphical user interface generated based on a second plurality of pattern matching rules, the second plurality of pattern matching rules based on expert knowledge about a second plurality of patterns in the information. (**Deitz**, ¶0287, ¶0010; 'Graphical user interface' of applicant is equivalent to 'interface' of Deitz. 'Second plurality of pattern matching rules' of applicant is the resulting output of the 'scale calculations' of Deitz.)

Deitz does not teach expressing the first transformed version and the second transformed version in a fast food restaurant information management destination system, the fast food restaurant information management system configured by the second transformed version to control information transfers in the fast food restaurant.

Jarett teaches expressing the first transformed version and the second transformed version in a fast food restaurant information management destination system, the fast food restaurant information management system configured by the second transformed version to control information transfers in the fast food restaurant. (**Jarett**, C5:12-58; Transformation of information regarding 'fast food restaurant information management destination system' of applicant is disclosed by the example of

Art Unit: 2129

'the fast food or trucking industry might use industry data' for comparison. Jarett illustrates a company within a company using fast food and trucking and the use of templates.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by employing the invention in the fast food industry as taught by Jarett to have express the first transformed version and the second transformed version in a fast food restaurant information management destination system, the fast food restaurant information management system configured by the second transformed version to control information transfers in the fast food restaurant.

For the purpose of illustrating the flexibility of the invention such that it can be used in other domains besides biopharmaceutical process batch manufacture.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-4, 8, 12, 14, 15, 18, 19, 23-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deitz as set forth above, in view of Jayaram. (U. S. Patent 6996589, referred to as **Jayaram**)

#### Claim 2

Deitz does not teach converting the information into a common format.

Jayaram teaches converting the information into a common format. (**Jayaram**, C11:15-55; One example of a 'common format' of applicant is 'XML' of Jayaram. ) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by using a consistence format as taught by Jayaram to converting the information into a common format.

For the purpose of avoiding additional computing cost associated with two or more formats.

#### Claim 3

Deitz does not teach converting the information into a user-definable syntax.

Jayaram teaches converting the information into a user-definable syntax. (**Jayaram**, C11:15-55; 'User definable syntax' of applicant is equivalent to 'configurable mapping language' of Jayaram.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of

Art Unit: 2129

Deitz by altering information into a user familiar syntax as taught by Jayaram to converting the information into a user-definable syntax.

For the purpose of having the invention easier to use for the user due to the fact the user defines syntax is employed.

#### Claim 4

Deitz does not teach converting the information into XML.

Jayaram teaches converting the information into XML. (**Jayaram**, C11:15-55; One example of a 'XML' of applicant is 'XML' of Jayaram. ) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by using XML as taught by Jayaram to converting the information into XML.

For the purpose of using an industrial standard code for ease of implementation across multiple platforms.

#### Claim 8

Deitz does not teach expressing the information in an XML syntax.

Jayaram teaches expressing the information in an XML syntax. (**Jayaram**, C11:15-55; One example of a 'XML' of applicant is 'XML' of Jayaram. ) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's

invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by using XML taught by Jayaram to expressing the information in an XML syntax.

For the purpose of using an industrial standard code for ease of expression across multiple platforms.

Claim 12

Deitz does not teach generating a plurality of options adapted for use in translation of an element of the information.

Jayaram teaches generating a plurality of options adapted for use in translation of an element of the information. (**Jayaram**, C13:1-47; 'Options' of applicant is equivalent to 'commands' of Jayaram.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by having options as taught by Jayaram to generating a plurality of options adapted for use in translation of an element of the information.

For the purpose of being able to generate options for obtaining different translations as needed.

Claim 14

Deitz does not teach creating graphical user interface elements adapted to present a plurality of options for translating an element of the information.

Jayaram teaches creating graphical user interface elements adapted to present a plurality of options for translating an element of the information. (**Jayaram**, C13:1-47;

'Options' of applicant is equivalent to 'commands' of Jayaram. 'Graphical user interface' of applicant is equivalent to 'GUI' of Jayaram. Jayaram illustrates that instructions may be entered by the GUI.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by being able to view the options as taught by Jayaram to creating graphical user interface elements adapted to present a plurality of options for translating an element of the information.

For the purpose of being able to view the possible options to use for translation functions.

#### Claim 15

Deitz does not teach presenting a plurality of options adapted for use in translation of an element of the information.

Jayaram teaches presenting a plurality of options adapted for use in translation of an element of the information. (**Jayaram**, C13:1-47; 'Presenting a plurality of options of applicant is equivalent to 'constructs in a selectable list' of Jayaram.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by displaying the options as taught by Jayaram to presenting a plurality of options adapted for use in translation of an element of the information.

For the purpose of being able to employ the possible options to use for translation functions.

Claim 18

Deitz does not teach presenting in the graphical user interface a plurality of options adapted for use in translation of an element of the information.

Jayaram teaches presenting in the graphical user interface a plurality of options adapted for use in translation of an element of the information. (**Jayaram**, C13:1-47; 'Graphical user interface' of applicant is equivalent to 'GUI' of Jayaram.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by combining the GUI and the generated options as taught by Jayaram to presenting in the graphical user interface a plurality of options adapted for use in translation of an element of the information.

For the purpose of reducing the effort to employ the options by using a GUI.

Claim 19

Deitz does not teach receiving a user-selected option from a plurality of options adapted for use in translation of an element of the information.

Jayaram teaches receiving a user-selected option from a plurality of options adapted for use in translation of an element of the information. (**Jayaram**, C13:1-47; 'Translating an element of the information' of applicant is equivalent to 'the GUI may further include a mapping language parser to ensure that any mapping dependency constraints are fulfilled' of Jayaram.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of



Art Unit: 2129

Deitz by being able to accept input as taught by Jayaram to receiving a user-selected option from a plurality of options adapted for use in translation of an element of the information.

For the purpose of having the invention take in input from the user so that the user can chose which translation options are desired.

#### Claim 23

Deitz does not teach tracking received user input adapted for use in translation of an element of the information.

Jayaram teaches tracking received user input adapted for use in translation of an element of the information. (**Jayaram**, C21:34-52; 'Tracking' of applicant is equivalent to 'tracking are published' of Jayaram.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by keeping a log as taught by Jayaram to tracking received user input adapted for use in translation of an element of the information.

For the purpose of aiding the user by avoiding duplicate translation request.

#### Claim 24

Deitz does not teach providing an audit trail of the user input relating to a translation of an element of the information.

Jayaram teaches providing an audit trail of the user input relating to a translation of an element of the information. (**Jayaram**, C21:34-52; 'Providing an audit trail' of applicant is equivalent to 'tracking are published' of Jayaram. This is due to the specification 'user input can be tracked, thereby providing an audit trial of user input.') It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by having audit trail generated as taught by Jayaram to providing an audit trail of the user input relating to a translation of an element of the information.

For the purpose of keeping track of the cost for the translations of the invention for possible display to the user.

#### Claim 25

Deitz does not teach providing an audit trail of the user input.

Jayaram teaches providing an audit trail of the user input. (**Jayaram**, C21:34-52; 'Providing an audit trail' of applicant is disclosed by 'tracking are published through a report' of Jayaram.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by outputting the audit trail as taught by Jayaram to providing an audit trail of the user input.

For the purpose of displaying the cost of the translation to the user so that the user can use this information to avoid audit trail costs thresholds.

Art Unit: 2129

Claim 26

Deitz does not teach repeating said applying activity.

Jayaram teaches repeating said applying activity. (**Jayaram**, Figure 9; 'Repeating said applying activity' of applicant is equivalent to the 'fail' arrow from 'business requirement compliance check' of Jayaram.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by allowing to repeat steps as taught by Jayaram to repeating said applying activity.

For the purpose of repeating a step if required so that a desired result can occur.

Claim 27

Deitz does not teach repeating said transforming activity.

Jayaram teaches repeating said transforming activity. (**Jayaram**, Figure 9; 'Repeating said transforming activity' of applicant is equivalent to 'the 'fail' arrow from the 'database attribute compliance check' of Jayaram.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by being able to repeat a transformation as taught by Jayaram to repeating said transforming activity.

For the purpose of employing an iteration technique for a desired result.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deitz as set forth above, in view of Payson. (U. S. Patent 6289266, referred to as **Payson**)

**Claim 5**

Deitz does not teach importing the first transformed version into the destination system, the first transformed version obtained from a Bailey INFI-90 configuration database.

Payson teaches importing the first transformed version into the destination system, the first transformed version obtained from a Bailey INFI-90 configuration database. (**Payson**, C5:1-5; 'Bailey INFI-90' of applicant is equivalent to 'INFI 90 available from Bailey' of Payson.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by using hardware as taught by Payson to importing the first transformed version

Art Unit: 2129

into the destination system, the first transformed version obtained from a Bailey INFI-90 configuration database.

For the purpose of using established hardware with proved results and compatibility history.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deitz as set forth above, in view of Talanis. (U. S. Patent Publication 20010047420, referred to as **Talanis**)

Claim 6

Deitz does not teach importing the second transformed version into the destination system the second transformed version comprising configuration elements associated with a WinCC operator console.

Talanis teaches importing the second transformed version into the destination system the second transformed version comprising configuration elements associated with a WinCC operator console. (**Talanis**, ¶0013; 'WinCC' of applicant is equivalent to 'WinCC' of Talanis.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by using WinCC as taught by Talanis to have importing the second transformed version into the destination system the second transformed version comprising configuration elements associated with a WinCC operator console.

For the purpose of using an established software package as WinCC for importing transforms versions with known reliability and results.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deitz as set forth above, in view of Mylopoulos. ('Knowbel: A Hybrid tool for building expert systems', referred to as **Mylopoulos**)

Claim 7

Deitz does not teach parsing the information, the information obtained from an APACS control system configuration database.

Mylopoulos teaches parsing the information, the information obtained from an APACS control system configuration database. (**Mylopoulos**, p22, C2:8 through p23, C1:51) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by using APACS as taught by Mylopoulos to have parsing the information, the information obtained from an APACS control system configuration database.

For the purpose of using established hardware with known reliability and performance for obtaining accurate results.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9-11, 13, 35, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deitz as set forth above, in view of Moore. (U. S. Patent Publication 20010056429, referred to as **Moore**)

Claim 9

Deitz does not teach applying XSLT transforms to the information.

Moore teaches applying XSLT transforms to the information. (**Moore**, ¶0291; 'XSLT transform' of applicant is equivalent to 'XSLT as a scripting language' of Moore.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by introducing XSLT as taught by Moore to apply XSLT transforms to the information.

For the purpose of using standard information technologies such as XSLT for obtaining reliable results.

Claim 10



Deitz does not teach applying XSLT transforms to the information and generating DHTML.

Moore teaches applying XSLT transforms to the information and generating DHTML. (**Moore**, ¶0291; 'XSLT transform' of applicant is equivalent to 'XSLT as a scripting language' of Moore. 'Generating DHTML' of applicant is equivalent to using as a presentation language of DHTML of Moore.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by applying XSLT to DHTML as taught by Moore to apply XSLT transforms to the information and generating DHTML.

For the purpose of generating a interface which a user can interact with.

#### Claim 11

Deitz does not teach generating DHTML encoding a plurality of options for translating an element of the information.

Moore teaches generating DHTML encoding a plurality of options for translating an element of the information. (**Moore**, ¶0291; 'Generating DHTML' of applicant is equivalent to using as a presentation language of DHTML of Moore. A 'presentation language' of Moore is equivalent to 'translating an element of the information' of applicant.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by using DHTML abilities as taught by Moore to generate DHTML encoding a plurality of options for translating an element of the information.

For the purpose of having a dynamic interface so the user can input translation requests.

Claim 13

Deitz does not teach interpreting a plurality of options adapted for use in translation of an element of the information using DHTML logic.

Moore teaches interpreting a plurality of options adapted for use in translation of an element of the information using DHTML logic. (Moore, ¶0291; 'Interpreting' of applicant is the presentation language function. ) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by using DHTML as taught by Moore to interpreting a plurality of options adapted for use in translation of an element of the information using DHTML logic.

For the purpose of using logic to provide accurate results obtained from the use of established software as DHTML logic.

Claim 35

Deitz does not teach wherein XSLT is employed to translate the information.

Moore teaches wherein XSLT is employed to translate the information. (Moore, ¶0291; 'XSLT transform' of applicant is equivalent to 'XSLT as a scripting language' of Moore.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by using XSLT as taught by Moore to have wherein XSLT is employed to translate the information.

For the purpose of using standard information technologies such as XSLT for obtaining reliable results in translation tasks.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 16, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deitz as set forth above, in view of the combination of Koizumi and Jayaram. (U. S. Patent Publication 20020026633, referred to as **Koizumi**; U. S. Patent 6996589, referred to as **Jayaram**)

Claim 16

Deitz does not teach presenting to each of a plurality of users, a plurality of options adapted for use in translation of an element of the information.

Koizumi teaches presenting to each of a plurality of users. (**Koizumi**, ¶0380; 'Plurality of users' of applicant is disclosed by the delivery of the object program to the

Art Unit: 2129

users of Koizumi.) Jayaram teaches a plurality of options adapted for use in translation of an element of the information. (**Jayaram**, C13:1-47; 'Plurality of options' of applicant is equivalent to 'commands' of Jayaram.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by presenting multiple options to multiple users as taught by Koizumi and Jayaram to presenting to each of a plurality of users, a plurality of options adapted for use in translation of an element of the information.

For the purpose of dividing the work tasks into different sections for increased productivity per time.

#### Claim 17

Deitz does not teach presenting to each of a plurality of users, a plurality of options adapted for use in translation of an element of the information, the plurality of options and the information element differing for each of the plurality of users.

Koizumi teaches presenting to each of a plurality of users. (**Koizumi**, ¶0380; 'Plurality of users' of applicant is disclosed by the delivery of the object program to the users of Koizumi.) Jayaram teaches a plurality of options adapted for use in translation of an element of the information, the plurality of options and the information element differing for each of the plurality of users. (**Jayaram**, C13:1-47, abstract; 'Presenting a plurality of options of applicant is equivalent to 'constructs in a selectable list' of Jayaram. 'Translating an element' of applicant is disclosed by the 'database conversion engine' of Jayaram.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the

Art Unit: 2129

art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by presenting multiple options of translations to multiple users as taught by Koizumi and Jayaram to presenting to each of a plurality of users, a plurality of options adapted for use in translation of an element of the information, the plurality of options and the information element differing for each of the plurality of users.

For the purpose of obtaining different translations for different users, such that user specialization can be utilized.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 21, 28-33, 36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deitz as set forth above, in view of Nixon. (U. S. Patent Publication 20020077711, referred to as **Nixon**)

Claim 21

Deitz does not teach receiving input from each of a plurality of users regarding each user's preference adapted for use in translation of an element of the information.

Nixon teaches receiving input from each of a plurality of users regarding each user's preference adapted for use in translation of an element of the information. (Nixon, ¶0048; 'Plurality of users' of Nixon is equivalent to 'one or more users' of Nixon. 'Receiving input from each of a plurality of users' of applicant is equivalent to 'each user interface routine can receive' of Nixon. 'Preference adapted for use in translation' of applicant is equivalent to 'information from the asset utilization suite' of Nixon.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by inputting multiple users translation request as taught by Nixon to receiving input from each of a plurality of users regarding each user's preference adapted for use in translation of an element of the information.

For the purpose of a multiple of users being able to input data so that each user can receive outputs from their specific requests.

Claim 28

Deitz does not teach providing a view of the destination system.

Nixon teaches comprising providing a view of the destination system. (Nixon, ¶0125; 'Providing a view' of applicant is equivalent to 'graphical views' of Nixon.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of

Art Unit: 2129

applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by providing output as taught by Nixon to have a view of the destination system.

For the purpose of seeing the interface of the system and the results of the translation which are imposed on the destination system.

#### Claim 29

Deitz does not teach providing a plurality of differing views of the destination system, each of the plurality of differing views corresponding to a different use for the destination system.

Nixon teaches providing a plurality of differing views of the destination system, each of the plurality of differing views corresponding to a different use for the destination system. (Nixon, ¶0125; 'Plurality of differing views' of applicant is equivalent to 'one or more pull down menus' of Nixon.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by providing multiple views as taught by Nixon to have a plurality of differing views of the destination system, each of the plurality of differing views corresponding to a different use for the destination system.

For the purpose of each user having their own view, due to the logic it would hinder the user to see results of other views which are of no concern to the user.

#### Claim 30

Deitz does not teach presenting in the graphical user interface the information and the second transformed version.

Nixon teaches presenting in the graphical user interface the information and the second transformed version. (**Nixon**, ¶0125, ¶0048; 'Graphical user interface' of applicant is equivalent to 'GUI' of Nixon.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by using GUI interface as taught by Nixon to have in the graphical user interface the information and the second transformed version.

For the purpose of using a GUI which allows for increase of ease of use for the user.

#### Claim 31

Deitz does not teach receiving input from each of a plurality of users regarding each user's preference adapted for use in translation of an element of the information.

Nixon teaches receiving input from each of a plurality of users regarding each user's preference adapted for use in translation of an element of the information. (**Nixon**, ¶0048; 'Plurality of users' of Nixon is equivalent to 'one or more users' of Nixon. 'Receiving input from each of a plurality of users' of applicant is equivalent to 'each user interface routine can receive' of Nixon. 'Preference adapted for use in translation' of applicant is equivalent to 'information from the asset utilization suite' of Nixon.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by having multiple users input e allowed as



Art Unit: 2129

taught by Nixon to have receiving input from each of a plurality of users regarding each user's preference adapted for use in translation of an element of the information.

For the purpose of allowing the user to dictate translation needs thus permitting the user to focus in on specific translation elements.

#### Claim 32

Deitz does not teach wherein the second transformed version is based on the first transformed version.

Nixon teaches wherein the second transformed version is based on the first transformed version. (**Nixon**, ¶0088; 'Second transformed version based on the first' of applicant can be seen as the 'hierarchy represents' of a user.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by altering an existing interface as taught by Nixon to have the second transformed version is based on the first transformed version.

For the purpose of updating an interface for greater or lesser content for increased accuracy of field of use.

#### Claim 33

Deitz does not teach wherein the second transformed version is not based on the first transformed version.

Nixon teaches wherein the second transformed version is not based on the first transformed version. (**Nixon**, ¶0048; 'Not based on the first transform' of applicant is equivalent to 'different sets' of Nixon.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by generating a new interface as taught by Nixon to have the second transformed version is not based on the first transformed version.

For the purpose of looking at a completely different interface if needed to observe different scenarios for other solutions which are outside a specific domain.

#### Claim 36

Deitz does not teach wherein at least one of the first plurality of patterns is a set.

Nixon teaches wherein at least one of the first plurality of patterns is a set. (**Nixon**, ¶0048; 'Patterns is a set' of applicant is disclosed by 'different sets' of Nixon.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by having information in a set as taught by Nixon to have at least one of the first plurality of patterns is a set.

For the purpose of using set theory in a abstract way to reduce input parameters or established scenarios for greater efficiency.

#### Claim 37

Deitz does not teach wherein at least one of the first plurality of patterns is a hierarchy.

Nixon teaches wherein at least one of the first plurality of patterns is a hierarchy. (Nixon, ¶0088; 'Patterns is a hierarchy' of applicant can be seen as the 'hierarchy represents' of a user.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by having a hierarchy structure in patterns as taught by Nixon to have wherein at least one of the first plurality of patterns is a hierarchy.

For the purpose of looking at hierarchy patterns related in a processing structure for increased understanding of an overall pattern.

#### Claim 38

Deitz does not teach wherein at least one of the first plurality of patterns is a naming convention.

Nixon teaches wherein at least one of the first plurality of patterns is a naming convention. (Nixon, Fig. 8; "naming convention" of applicant is illustrated by the examples of 'Mixing-reagent1', 'Mixer-in1', 'Mixer-reagent2', 'Mixer-in2', 'Mixer-feed', 'Mixer-in', "Static mixer" and 'Mixer-out' of Nixon.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by using naming conventions as taught by Nixon to have at least one of the first plurality of patterns is a naming convention.

For the purpose of ease of search based on the name of patterns.

#### Claim 39

Deitz does not teach wherein the user input is derived from input from a first user and input from a second user.

Nixon teaches wherein the user input is derived from input from a first user and input from a second user. (**Nixon, ¶0048**; Nixon discloses that one or more users can subscribe to the same or different sets of data.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by having multiple users work on each other's input as taught by Nixon to have wherein the user input is derived from input from a first user and input from a second user.

For the purpose of being to modify each other work for improved results.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deitz as set forth above, in view the combination of Koizumi and Betawar. (U. S. Patent

Publication 20020026633, referred to as **Koizumi**; U. S. Patent Publication 20020055804, referred to as **Betawar**)

Claim 22

Deitz does not teach receiving input from each of a plurality of users regarding each user's preference for translating an element of the information, a first user's preference overriding a second user's preference.

Koizumi teaches receiving input from each of a plurality of users (**Koizumi**, ¶0380; 'Plurality of users' of applicant is disclosed by the delivery of the object program to the users of Koizumi.) Betawar teaches regarding each user's preference for translating an element of the information, a first user's preference overriding a second user's preference. (**Betawar**, ¶0057; In this example, 'First user' of applicant is equivalent to 'engineering supervisors of Betawar. Second user of applicant is equivalent to 'lower level line engineers'.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by having multiple users in which one user can override another input as taught by Koizumi and Betawar to receiving input from each of a plurality of users regarding each user's preference for translating an element of the information, a first user's preference overriding a second user's preference.

For the purpose of having more than one person being able to override a preference for increased accuracy or prevention of an error.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deitz as set forth above, in view of Koizumi. (U. S. Patent Publication 20020026633, referred to as **Koizumi**)

Claim 34

Deitz does not teach wherein a pattern matching rule from the first plurality of pattern matching rules is based on a plurality of knowledge elements and at least one known relationship between the plurality of knowledge elements, each of the plurality of knowledge elements identifiable as an entity in the information.

Koizumi teaches wherein a pattern matching rule from the first plurality of pattern matching rules is based on a plurality of knowledge elements and at least one known relationship between the plurality of knowledge elements, each of the plurality of knowledge elements identifiable as an entity in the information. (**Koizumi**; ¶0054;

'Pattern matching rule' of applicant is equivalent to 'translation rules' of Koizumi.

'Knowledge elements' and 'known relationship' of applicant is illustrated by the function of the ARM (abstract register machine) of Koizumi.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by using rules based on knowledge elements as taught by Koizumi to a pattern matching rule from the first plurality of pattern matching rules is based on a plurality of knowledge elements and at least one known relationship between the plurality of knowledge elements, each of the plurality of knowledge elements identifiable as an entity in the information.

For the purpose of using rules that follow elements and there relationship between them which aids in viewing patterns as clusters (or relationships) and thus using rules only associated with a specific cluster (or relationship) and the associated efficiency.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Art Unit: 2129

Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 40-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deitz as set forth above, in view Betawar. (U. S. Patent Publication 20020055804, referred to as **Betawar**)

Claim 40

Deitz does not teach wherein the user input is derived from input from a first user and input from a second user, the first user occupying a different position in a value chain than the second user.

Betawar teaches wherein the user input is derived from input from a first user and input from a second user, the first user occupying a different position in a value chain than the second user. (**Betawar**, ¶0057; 'First user' of applicant is equivalent to 'lower level line engineers' of Betawar. 'Input is derived' and 'input from a second user' of applicant is illustrated by the supervisor being able to edit parameters.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by users having different authority positions as taught by Betawar to wherein the user input is derived from input from a first user and input from a second user, the first user occupying a different position in a value chain than the second user.

For the purpose of having the role of supervisor incorporated within the specification for increased accuracy.



Claim 41

Deitz does not teach wherein the user input is derived from input from a first user and input from a second user, the first user occupying a different position in a business process than the second user.

Betawar teaches wherein the user input is derived from input from a first user and input from a second user, the first user occupying a different position in a business process than the second user. (**Betawar**, ¶0057; 'Different position' of applicant is equivalent to the difference 'lower level line engineers' and 'engineering supervisors' of Betawar.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by having users at different authority levels as taught by Betawar to have wherein the user input is derived from input from a first user and input from a second user, the first user occupying a different position in a business process than the second user.

For the purpose of having the role of supervisor incorporated in a business setting within the specification for increased profits.

Claim 42

Deitz does not teach wherein the user input is derived from input from a first user and input from a second user, at least a portion of the input from the second user altering at least a portion of the input from the first user.

Betawar teaches wherein the user input is derived from input from a first user and input from a second user, at least a portion of the input from the second user altering at least a portion of the input from the first user. (**Betawar**, ¶0057; 'First user' of applicant is equivalent to 'lower level line engineers' of Betawar. 'Input is derived' and 'input from a second user' of applicant is illustrated by the supervisor being able to edit parameters.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Deitz by having the supervisor being able to alter input of another user as taught by Betawar to have wherein the user input is derived from input from a first user and input from a second user, at least a portion of the input from the second user altering at least a portion of the input from the first user.

For the purpose of the supervisor or making changes on lower level users input for modification or alteration for increased accuracy.

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed on May 30, 2008 for claims 1-44 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.
8. In reference to the Applicant's argument:

Regarding p10 and enablement rejections.

Examiner's response:

The Examiner withdraws the rejection based on the amended claims.

9. In reference to the Applicant's argument:

Regarding p10-11 section II 'anticipation rejections'

Examiner's response:

Deitz is no longer used as a reference for the independent claims. Deitz is used for the independent claims. 'Biopharmaceutical batch process control system' of applicant is equivalent to 'batch oriented process control systems including for example process control systems that produce pharmaceuticals' of Deitz. (**Deitz**, C5:17-46;); 'Hierarchy among elements of the configuration' of applicant is illustrated by 'received a second message containing a set of batch information in response to the first message requesting ... using a graphical user interface and prompts a user to enter a first input identifying a subset of set of batch information from the displayed set of batch information from the displayed set of batch information to be included within at least one batch of the plurality of batches' of Deitz. (**Deitz**, C4:9-32); 'First transformed version of the configuration information using user input to obtain a second transformed version of the configuration information' of applicant is equivalent to 'editing' of Deitz. (**Deitz**, Fig. 9, C5:7-9, C13:49 through C14:10) 'DHTML logic' of applicant is not true 'logic' in the

Art Unit: 2129

classical definition of 'logic.' DMTHL is a combination of a number computer languages which enable web pages to be dynamic. Thus since Deitz is able to be edited and be used over the internet, then DHTML is inherent. (**Deitz**, C1:36-50, C16:46-54)

'Expressing the first transformed version and the second transformed' of applicant is disclosed by the ability to 'monitor the campaign status' of Deitz. (**Deitz**, C8:28-55;)

Office Action stands.

10. In reference to the Applicant's argument:

Concerning p11 through p17 in light of KSR International Co. vs Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. , 127 S. Ct. 1727, 2007 U.S. Lexis 4745 (2007). The applicant emphasizes 'a reason that would have prompted' a person of ordinary skill in the art to make such a combination.

Examiner's response:

All claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 have stated reasons to combine references.

Office Action stands.

11. In reference to the Applicant's argument:

Concerning p18 through p22.

Examiner's response:

Claim 2 states 'For the purpose of avoiding additional computing cost associated with two or more formats.' Claim 3 states 'For the purpose of having the invention easier to use for the user due to the fact the user defines syntax is employed.' Claim 4

Art Unit: 2129

states 'For the purpose of using an industrial standard code for ease of implementation across multiple platforms.'

12. In reference to the Applicant's argument:

Concerning p22-23.

Examiner's response:

Claim 5 states using a Bailey INFI-90 database. (**Payson**, C5:1-5; 'Bailey INFI-90' of applicant is equivalent to 'INFI 90 available from Bailey' of Payson.) Applicant arguments that 'importing' information is not stated within a database, due to the fact that it is inherent that information can be 'imported into a database. 'First transformed version' is addresses within the independent claim. 'Destination system' is information going to the database. 'Configuration database' is the database itself. Office Action stands.

13. In reference to the Applicant's argument:

Concerning p23-25.

Examiner's response:

Claim 6 uses an WinCC operator console. 'WinCC' of applicant is equivalent to 'WinCC' of Talanis. (Talanis, ¶0013) Applicant arguments that 'importing' information is not stated within a database, due to the fact that it is inherent that information can be 'imported into a database. 'Second transformed version' is addresses within the independent claim. . 'Destination system' is information going to the database. 'Configuration database' is the database itself. Office Action stands.

14. In reference to the Applicant's argument:

Concerning p25-59

Examiner's response:

Claim 7 states 'For the purpose of using established hardware with known reliability and performance for obtaining accurate results.' Claim 8 states 'For the purpose of using an industrial standard code for ease of expression across multiple platforms.' Claim 9 states 'For the purpose of using standard information technologies such as XSLT for obtaining reliable results.' Claim 10 states 'For the purpose of generating a interface which a user can interact with.' Claim 11 states 'For the purpose of having a dynamic interface so the user can input translation requests.' Claim 12 states 'For the purpose of being able to generate options for obtaining different translations as needed.' Claim 13 states 'For the purpose of using logic to provide accurate results obtained from the use of established software as DHTML logic.' Claim

14 states 'For the purpose of being able to view the possible options to use for translation functions.' Claim 15 states 'For the purpose of being able to employ the possible options to use for translation functions.' Claim 16 states 'For the purpose of dividing the work tasks into different sections for increased productivity per time.' Claim 17 states 'For the purpose of obtaining different translations for different users, such that user specialization can be utilized.' Claim 18 states 'For the purpose of reducing the effort to employ the options by using a GUI.' Claim 19 states 'For the purpose of having the invention take in input from the user so that the user can chose which translation options are desired.' Claim 21 states 'For the purpose of a multiple of users being able to input data so that each user can receive outputs from their specific requests.' Claim 22 states 'For the purpose of having more than one person being able to override a preference for increased accuracy or prevention of an error.' Claim 23 states 'For the purpose of aiding the user by avoiding duplicate translation request.' Claim 24 states 'For the purpose of keeping track of the cost for the translations of the invention for possible display to the user.' Claim 25 states 'For the purpose of displaying the cost of the translation to the user so that the user can use this information to avoid audit trail costs thresholds.' Claim 26 states 'For the purpose of repeating a step if required so that a desired result can occur.' Claim 27 states 'For the purpose of employing an iteration technique for a desired result.' Claim 28 states 'For the purpose of seeing the interface of the system and the results of the translation which are imposed on the destination system.' Claim 29 states 'For the purpose of each user having their own view, due to the logic it would hinder the user to see results of other views which are of

no concern to the user.' Claim 30 states 'For the purpose of using a GUI which allows for increase of ease of use for the user.' Claim 31 states 'For the purpose of allowing the user to dictate translation needs thus permitting the user to focus in on specific translation elements.' Claim 32 states 'For the purpose of updating an interface for greater or lesser content for increased accuracy of field of use.' Claim 33 states 'For the purpose of looking at a completely different interface if needed to observe different scenarios for other solutions which are outside a specific domain.' Claim 34 states 'For the purpose of using rules that follow elements and there relationship between them which aids in viewing patterns as clusters (or relationships) and thus using rules only associated with a specific cluster (or relationship) and the associated efficiency.' Claim 35 states 'For the purpose of using standard information technologies such as XSLT for obtaining reliable results in translation tasks.' Claim 36 states 'For the purpose of using set theory in a abstract way to reduce input parameters or established scenarios for greater efficiency.' Claim 37 states 'For the purpose of looking at hierarchy patterns related in a processing structure for increased understanding of an overall pattern.' Claim 38 states 'For the purpose of ease of search based on the name of patterns.' Claim 39 states 'For the purpose of being to modify each other work for improved results.' Claim 40 states 'For the purpose of having the role of supervisor incorporated within the specification for increased accuracy.' Claim 41 states 'For the purpose of having the role of supervisor incorporated in a business setting within the specification for increased profits.' Claim 42 states 'For the purpose of the supervisor or making changes on lower level users input for modification or alteration for increased accuracy.'



Art Unit: 2129

All these statements are reasons to combine the references of the dependent claims to the single reference of the independent claims. Office Action stands.

15. In reference to the Applicant's argument:

Regarding p59-61

Examiner's response:

This claim is restricted due to the different domain then that of claims 1-44. Office Action stands.

### ***Examination Considerations***

16. The claims and only the claims form the metes and bounds of the invention.

"Office personnel are to give the claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim. *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d, 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-551 (CCPA 1969)" (MPEP p 2100-8, c 2, I 45-48; p 2100-9, c 1, I 1-4). The Examiner has the full latitude to interpret each claim in the broadest reasonable sense. Examiner will reference prior art using terminology familiar to one of ordinary skill in the

art. Such an approach is broad in concept and can be either explicit or implicit in meaning.

17. Examiner's Notes are provided to assist the applicant to better understand the nature of the prior art, application of such prior art and, as appropriate, to further indicate other prior art that maybe applied in other office actions. Such comments are entirely consistent with the intent and sprit of compact prosecution. However, and unless otherwise stated, the Examiner's Notes are not prior art but link to prior art that one of ordinary skill in the art would find inherently appropriate.

18. Examiner's Opinion: Paragraphs 16 and 17 apply. The Examiner has full latitude to interpret each claim in the broadest reasonable sense.

### ***Conclusion***

19. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

20. Claims 1-44 are rejected.  
Claim 45 is restricted.

***Correspondence Information***

21. Any inquiry concerning this information or related to the subject disclosure should be directed to the Examiner Peter Coughlan, whose telephone number is (571) 272-

Art Unit: 2129

5990. The Examiner can be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:15 a.m. to 3:45 p.m.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor David Vincent can be reached at (571) 272-3080. Any response to this office action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks,  
Washington, D. C. 20231;

Hand delivered to:

Receptionist,  
Customer Service Window,  
Randolph Building,  
401 Dulany Street,  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313,

(located on the first floor of the south side of the Randolph Building);

or faxed to:

(571) 272-3150 (for formal communications intended for entry.)

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have any questions on access to Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).

Art Unit: 2129

/P. C./

Examiner, Art Unit 2129

Peter Coughlan

6/16/2008

/David R Vincent/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2129